# Case 2:22-cv-03383-MSG\_Document 1\_Filed 08/24/22 Page 1 of 14 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil de			HIS FORM.)	77, is required for the use of	and Cherk of Court for the		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Brian Chapman, individua	ally and on behalf of a	ll others similarly situa	DEFENDANTS eLocal USA, LLC				
<b>(b)</b> County of Residence of (E.	f First Listed Plaintiff <u>N</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Monroe County, NY  ASES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Zachary Silverstein - Lun 450 N. Narbeth Avenue, Lower Merion, PA 19072	dy, Beldecos & Milby, Suite 200		Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif		
J 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff   J 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF  Citizen of This State  1				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State				
W. NATURE OF SUIT	D.		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	1	**	FODEFITUDE/PENALTV	RANKDUPTCV	OTHED STATUTES		
CONTRACT  ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERTY  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	FORFEITURE/PENALTY    625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881   690 Other      LABOR	BANKRUPTCY  □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES  □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	moved from 3  Cite the U.S. Civil State 47 U.S.C. 227, et  Brief description of call Violations of the	Appellate Court atute under which you are fit seq. ause: Telephone Consumer	(specify) illing (Do not cite jurisdictional state  Protection Act	er District Litigation  (utes unless diversity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only  JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:  X Yes  No		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE	NATIVO DE DEGOTO	DOCKET NUMBER			
08/23/2022		signature of attor					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE		

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
  - County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
  - Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. **Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is IV. sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes. V.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

# Case 2:22-cv-03383-ly/steed Spockers district Fideoly/08/24/22 Page 3 of 14 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## **DESIGNATION FORM**

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff:								
Address of Defendant:								
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:								
RELAT	ED CASE, IF ANY:							
Case Nu	ımber: Judge:			Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when <i>Yes</i> is answered to any of the following questions:								
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes ☐ No ☐ previously terminated action in this court?								
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?								
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?								
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights  Yes  No  No				No 🗆				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.								
DATE: _	Zachary Attorney-at-Lo	A. Silv	erstein	<del></del>				
	Attorney-at-La	w / Pro Se	Plaintiff	Attorn	ey I.D. # (if applicable)			
CIVIL:	(Place a $$ in one category only)							
CIVIL:	(Place a $$ in one category only)  Federal Question Cases:	В. Д	iversity Jurisdiction C	Cases:				
A.         □       1.         □       2.         □       3.         □       4.         □       5.         □       6.         □       7.         □       8.         □       9.         □       10.	Federal Question Cases:  Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust	B. D  □ 1. □ 2. □ 3. □ 4. □ 5. □ 6. □ 7. □ 8. □ 9.	Insurance Contra Airplane Persona Assault, Defama Marine Personal Motor Vehicle F Other Personal I Products Liabilit Products Liabilit All other Divers	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury (njury (Please specify) ty ty — Asbestos	:			
A.         □       1.         □       2.         □       3.         □       4.         □       5.         □       6.         □       7.         □       8.         □       9.         □       10.	Federal Question Cases:  Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1.	Insurance Contra Airplane Person. Assault, Defama Marine Personal Motor Vehicle P Other Personal I Products Liabilit Products Liabilit All other Divers (Please specify): _	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury (njury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases	:			
A.         □       1.         □       2.         □       3.         □       4.         □       5.         □       6.         □       7.         □       8.         □       9.         □       10.	Federal Question Cases:  Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  ARBITRAT (The effect of this certification is to	1.	Insurance Contra Airplane Person Assault, Defama Marine Personal Motor Vehicle P Other Personal I Products Liabilit Products Liabilit All other Divers (Please specify):	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury (njury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases	:			
A.         □       1.         □       2.         □       3.         □       4.         □       5.         □       6.         □       7.         □       8.         □       9.         □       10.	Federal Question Cases:  Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1.	Insurance Contra Airplane Persona Assault, Defama Marine Personal I Motor Vehicle F Other Personal I Products Liability Products Liability All other Divers (Please specify):	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury Injury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases	:			
A. □ 1. □ 2. □ 3. □ 4. □ 5. □ 6. □ 7. □ 8. □ 9. □ 10. □ 11.	Federal Question Cases:  Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  ARBITRAT (The effect of this certification is to the contract of the cont	1.	Insurance Contra Airplane Persona Assault, Defama Marine Personal I Motor Vehicle F Other Personal I Products Liability Products Liability All other Divers (Please specify):	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury Injury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases	:			
A.	Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1.	Insurance Contra Airplane Person Assault, Defama Marine Personal Motor Vehicle F Other Personal I Products Liabilin Products Liabilin All other Divers (Please specify):	act and Other Contra al Injury ation I Injury Personal Injury Injury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases	:			
A.	Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	ION CER plaintiff, downwheeld when when when when when when when when	Insurance Contra Airplane Person Assault, Defama Marine Personal Motor Vehicle F Other Personal I Products Liabilin Products Liabilin All other Divers (Please specify):	act and Other Contra al Injury ation Injury Personal Injury Injury (Please specify) ty ty – Asbestos ity Cases  for arbitration.)	:			

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

**Brian Chapman**, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Case No.

Plaintiff,

v. **eLocal USA, LLC,** a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

# CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Brian Chapman ("Chapman" or "Plaintiff") brings this Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial ("Complaint") against Defendant eLocal USA, LLC ("eLocal" or "Defendant") to: (1) stop its practice of placing calls using "an artificial or prerecorded voice" to the telephones of consumers nationwide without their prior express consent, (2) enjoin Defendant from continuing to place prerecorded telephone calls to consumers who did not provide their prior express consent to receive them, and (3) obtain redress for all persons injured by its conduct. Plaintiff, for his Complaint, alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by his attorneys.

# NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. eLocal is a marketing company based in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.
- 2. Unfortunately for consumers, Defendant casts its marketing net too wide. That is, in an attempt to promote its products and services, Defendant conducted (and continues to conduct) a wide-scale telemarketing campaign that features the repeated making of unsolicited

prerecorded phone calls to consumers' telephones without consent and in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the "TCPA").

- 3. By making these prerecorded calls, Defendant caused Plaintiff and the members of the Class actual harm and cognizable legal injury. This includes the aggravation and nuisance and invasions of privacy that result from the receipt of such prerecorded calls, in addition to the wear and tear on their telephones, consumption of battery life, consumption of memory on their phones and voicemail, lost minutes, loss of value realized for the monies consumers paid to their carriers for the receipt of such calls, in the form of the diminished use, enjoyment, value, and utility of their telephone plans. Furthermore, Defendant made the calls knowing they interfered with Plaintiff and the other Class members' use and enjoyment of, and the ability to access their phones, including the related data, voicemail, software, and hardware components.
- 4. The TCPA was enacted to protect consumers from prerecorded phone calls like those alleged and described herein. In response to Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff files this lawsuit seeking injunctive relief, requiring Defendant to cease all prerecorded telephone calling activities to telephones without first obtaining prior express written consent, as well as an award of statutory damages to the members of the Classes under the TCPA, costs, and reasonable attorney's fees

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff Chapman is a natural person and resident of New York. He resides in Rochester, New York.
- 6. Defendant is a limited liability company with a principal place of business located in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania. Defendant transacts business in this District, is headquartered in this District, and places unlawful calls to consumers from this District.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as the action arises under the TCPA, which is a federal statute. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant solicits consumers in this District, and because the wrongful conduct giving rise to this case occurred in and/or was directed to this District.
- 8. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Defendant resides in this District and the wrongful conduct giving rise to this case occurred in and/or emanated from this District.

### **COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 9. In recent years, companies such as eLocal have turned to unsolicited telemarketing as a way to increase their customer base. Widespread telemarketing is a primary method by which Defendant recruits new customers.
- 10. As explained by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") in its 2012 order, the TCPA requires "prior express written consent for all autodialed or prerecorded telemarketing calls to wireless numbers and residential lines." In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG No. 02-278, FCC 12-21, 27 FCC Rcd. 1830 ¶ 2 (Feb. 15, 2012).
- 11. In plain violation of this rule, Defendant fails to obtain any prior express written consent to make prerecorded calls to cellular and landline telephone numbers.
- 12. In placing the prerecorded calls that form the basis of this Complaint, Defendant utilized a prerecorded voice that played a prerecorded message even if the call was answered by an answering machine as opposed to a live person.

- 13. Furthermore, Defendant calls customers who have no "established business relationship" with Defendant and who are registered on the Do Not Call Registry.
- 14. Prior to placing these prerecorded voice calls to consumers, Defendant failed to obtain express written consent as required by the TCPA.
- 15. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendant was and is fully aware that unsolicited telemarketing calls are being made to consumers' telephones through its own efforts and their agents.
- 16. Defendant knowingly made (and continues to make) unsolicited prerecorded telemarketing calls without the prior express written consent of the call recipients as well as calls to those on the national do not call registry. In so doing, Defendant not only invaded the personal privacy of Plaintiff and members of the putative Class, but also intentionally and repeatedly violated the TCPA.

# FACTS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF CHAPMAN

- 17. Chapman is the owner and customary user of a cellphone number ending in 0723. This number is for Chapman's personal use and is not used for business purposes.
- 18. On July 2, 2021, Chapman received an unsolicited telemarketing call on his cellphone from the number 877-894-1467. The call featured an artificial or pre-recorded voice and solicited Chapman to purchase the services of "Call a Pro". This call was placed by Defendant eLocal.
- 19. On July 15, 2021, Chapman received an unsolicited telemarketing call on his cellphone from the number 888-996-4606. Like the July 2, 2021 call, this call featured an artificial or pre-recorded voice and solicited Chapman to purchase the services of "Call a Pro". It also was placed by or on behalf of Defendant eLocal.

- 20. Plaintiff knew the calls were pre-recorded because the voice didn't have the cadence of a live person. Plaintiff, and all reasonable people, are able to understand when they are speaking with a person and when they are hearing a recording.
- 21. During all times relevant, Plaintiff did not consent orally or in writing for Defendant to place prerecorded calls to him. Simply put, Defendant never obtained Plaintiff's prior written (or oral, for that matter) express consent to place any telephone calls to him using a prerecorded voice.
- 22. By making unauthorized prerecorded telephone calls as alleged herein, Defendant has caused consumers actual harm in the form of annoyance, nuisance, and invasion of privacy. In addition, the calls disturbed Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of his phone, interfered with his use and enjoyment of his voicemail, took up space in his voicemail memory and required his time to listen to, in addition to the wear and tear on the phone's hardware (including the phone's battery) and the consumption of memory on Plaintiff's phone. In the present case, a consumer could be subjected to many unsolicited prerecorded telephone calls as the Defendant do not take care to ensure that the recipients of its prerecorded calls have given their prior express written consent to be called.
- 23. In order to redress these injuries, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the class of similarly situated individuals, bring suit under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.*, which prohibits unsolicited prerecorded telephone calls to telephones without prior express written consent.
- 24. On behalf of the Class, Plaintiff seeks an injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited prerecorded telephone calling activities in the absence of prior express written consent, and an award of statutory damages to the class members to be paid into a common fund

for the benefit of the Class, together with costs and reasonable attorney's fees to be paid from any such common fund.

### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

25. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and Rule 23(b)(3) on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated and seeks certification of the following Class:

Prerecorded No Consent Class: All persons in the United States from four years prior to the filing of this action through the date the date notice is sent to the Class who (1) received a telemarketing call made by eLocal or on behalf of eLocal, (2) on the person's telephone, (3) using an artificial or prerecorded voice, (4) for the purpose of soliciting the sale of a product or service, and (5) for whom Defendant claims prior express written consent was obtained in the same manner as Defendant claims prior express written consent was obtained to call the Plaintiff.

- 26. The following individuals are excluded from the Class: (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this action and members of their families; (2) Defendant, its subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former employees, officers, and directors; (3) Plaintiff's attorneys; (4) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the classes; (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons; and (6) persons whose claims against Defendant have been fully and finally adjudicated and/or released. Plaintiff anticipates the need to amend the class definitions following appropriate discovery.
- 27. **Numerosity**: The exact size of the Class is unknown and not available to Plaintiff at this time, but it is clear that individual joinder is impracticable. On information and belief, Defendant placed prerecorded telephone calls to thousands of consumers who fall into the

definition of the Class. Members of the Class can be easily identified through Defendant's records.

- 28. **Commonality and Predominance**: There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiff and the Class, and those questions predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Class. Common questions for the Class include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:
  - (a) whether Defendant's conduct constitutes a violation of the TCPA;
  - (b) whether Defendant systematically made telephone calls to members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class without first obtaining prior express written consent to make the calls;
  - (c) whether Defendant utilized a prerecorded voice to make its calls to members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class;
  - (d) whether Defendant made prerecorded telephone calls to members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class without first obtaining prior express written consent to make the calls;
  - (e) whether members of the Class are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant's conduct; and
  - (f) whether Defendant obtained prior express written consent to contact any class members.
- 29. Adequate Representation: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class, and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class actions. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to those of the Class, and Defendant has no defenses unique to Plaintiff. Plaintiff and his counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Class, and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor his counsel has any interest adverse to the Class.
- 30. **Appropriateness**: This class action is also appropriate for certification because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class and as a

whole, thereby requiring the Court's imposition of uniform relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the members of the Class and making final class-wide injunctive relief appropriate. Defendant's business practices apply to and affect the members of the Class uniformly, and Plaintiff's challenge of those practices hinges on Defendant's conduct with respect to the Class as a whole, not on facts or law applicable only to Plaintiff. Additionally, the damages suffered by individual members of the Class will likely be small relative to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex litigation necessitated by Defendant's actions. Thus, it would be virtually impossible for the members of the Class to obtain effective relief from Defendant's misconduct on an individual basis. A class action provides the benefits of single adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Economies of time, effort, and expense will be fostered and uniformity of decisions will be ensured.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

Telephone Consumer Protection Act (Violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.)
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Prerecorded No Consent Class)

- 31. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing factual allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 32. Defendant made telephone calls using an artificial or pre-recorded voice to telephone numbers belonging to Plaintiff and other members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class without first obtaining prior express written consent to receive such calls. Written consent is required, yet Defendant failed to obtain written or oral consent.
- 33. The prerecorded voice calls actually played a prerecorded voice on Plaintiff's telephone.

- 34. By making the unsolicited telephone calls to Plaintiff and the Prerecorded No Consent Class members' telephones without their prior express written consent, and by utilizing a prerecorded voice to make those calls, Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 35. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class are each entitled a minimum of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) in damages for each such violation of the TCPA.
- 36. In the event that the Court determines that Defendant's conduct was willful and knowing, it may, under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C), treble the amount of statutory damages recoverable by Plaintiff and the other members of the Prerecorded No Consent Class.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- 1. An order certifying the Class as defined above, appointing Plaintiff Chapman as the representative of the Classes, and appointing his counsel as Class Counsel;
- 2. An award of actual monetary loss from such violations or the sum of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each violation, whichever is greater all to be paid into a common fund for the benefit of the Plaintiff and the Class Members;
  - 3. An order declaring that Defendant's actions, as set out above, violate the TCPA;
- 4. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's telephone calling equipment constitutes an automatic telephone dialing system under the TCPA;
- 5. An order requiring Defendant to disgorge any ill-gotten funds acquired as a result of its unlawful telephone calling practices;

- 6. An order requiring Defendant to identify any third-party involved in the prerecorded calling as set out above, as well as the terms of any contract or compensation arrangement it has with such third parties;
- 7. An injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited prerecorded calling activities, and otherwise protecting the interests of the Class;
- 8. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using, or contracting the use of, a prerecorded voice without obtaining, and maintaining records of, call recipient's prior express written consent to receive calls made with such equipment;
- 9. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from contracting with any third-party for marketing purposes until it establishes and implements policies and procedures for ensuring the third-party's compliance with the TCPA;
- 10. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to be paid out of the common fund prayed for above; and
  - 11. Such other and further relief that the Court deems reasonable and just.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff requests a trial by jury of all claims that can be so tried.

Respectfully Submitted,

BRIAN CHAPMAN, individually and on behalf of class of similarly situated individuals

/s/ Zachary A. Silverstein Dated: August 24, 2022 By:

Zachary A. Silverstein zsilverstein@lbmlaw.com Lundy, Beldecos & Milby, P.C. 450 N. Narbeth Avenue, Suite 200 Narberth, PA 19072

Telephone: 610-668-07700

Patrick H. Peluso\* ppeluso@woodrowpeluso.com Woodrow & Peluso, LLC 3900 East Mexico Ave., Suite 300 Denver, Colorado 80210 Telephone: (720) 213-0675

Facsimile: (303) 927-0809

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

\* Pro Hac Vice admission to be sought